

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 8 are amended for the purpose of clarity. No new matter is added.

The Office Action objects to the drawings as including a reference character mentioned in the description and to the specification as including informalities. The specification is amended to obviate these objections.

The Office Action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claim 8 is amended to obviate the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully solicited.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Goffinet (U.S. 5,905,906) and rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C §103(a) over Goffinet in view of Tateyama (U.S. 6,425,019). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Goffinet discloses a determining unit configured to determine whether or not the model information of the first device and the model information of the second device coincide with each other. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Goffinet does not disclose or suggest causing the information processing apparatus or the second device to determine whether or not the model information of the first device and the ... second device coincide, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 2 and 6-8.

Goffinet discloses downloading and transmitting printer configuration information on a bi-directional communications network. See Goffinet Fig. 6. In col. 15, lines 6-9, Goffinet discloses that "under normal circumstances, it is preferred that such setup or configuration information for a particular printer be utilized on other printers having the identical model number." However, this passage only states that the other printers preferably have the identical model number so that setup and configuration information can be shared and does not disclose or suggest causing the information processing apparatus or the second device to

determine whether or not the model information of the first device and the ... second device coincide, as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claims 2 and 6-8. That is, although Goffinet states a preference for the model numbers being the same, the reference does not disclose or suggest any method or mechanism for determining that the model numbers are the same.

There is nothing in Goffinet which discloses or suggests causing the information processing apparatus or the second device to determine whether or not the model information of the first device and the ... second device coincide, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 2 and 6-8. Accordingly, Goffinet does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1, 2 and 6-8.

The Office Action asserts that Tateyama discloses that the identification comprises an MAC address of the device. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Tateyama does not disclose or suggest causing the information processing apparatus or the second device to determine whether or not the model information of the first device and the ... second device coincide, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 2 and 6-8. Thus, Tateyama cannot supply the subject matter missing from Goffinet.

In view of the above, Goffinet and Tateyama, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1, 2 and 6-8. Claims 3-5 depend from claim 2. Thus, Goffinet and Tateyama, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1-8. Withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and/or 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully solicited.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-8 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kipman T. Werking
Registration No. 60,187

JAO:KTW/eks

Date: December 20, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
